MAR 2 3 2007

- IFW

PTO/SB/21 (09-06) Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE nder the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number Application Number 10/784.717 Filing Date TRANSMITTAL February 23, 2004 First Named Inventor **FORM** Mark A. Bennett Art Unit 3683 **Examiner Name** Christopher P. Schwartz (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 28679-04780 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC **√** Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer **Extension of Time Request** below): - Return receipt postcard Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Calfee, Halter & Griswold Signature Printed name Paul E. Szabo Reg. No. Date 30,429 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is beined facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name | Hatrice L. Simpson

Date

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Certificate of Mailing	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited	
on 3/20/07 with the United States Postal	
Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an	
envelope addressed to:	
Commissioner for Patents	
P.O. Box 14 <i>5</i> 0 / //	
Alexandria, VA 227/13-1450	
Typed or Printed name of person signing this certificate:	
Till days	
Signature:	

Patrice L. Simpson

Customer Number

24024

**PATENT** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Mark Bennett et al.	) Examiner: Christopher P. Schwartz
Serial No.: 10/784,717	) Art Unit: 3746
Filed: February 23, 2004	) Confirmation No.: 1435
For: ELECTRO-PNEUMATIC LATCHING VALVE SYSTEM	) Attorney Docket No.: 28679/04780
Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	

## RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

Applicant elects for prosecution Species A, Figure 3. Applicant elects claims 11-30. Of these, claims 11 and 15-30 read on the elected Species.

Applicant respectfully traverses the requirement for an election between Species A and Species B. Applicant believes that these should be examined together. They relate to similar subject matter, differing primarily in whether there is a trailer involved or just a straight truck.

Specifically, in the application, it is noted that an electrically controlled park control system has been desired for 30 years but has never been implemented. One reason is that such a system must be fail safe, in the sense that, if the electricity goes out, the system will set the parking brakes (or allow them to be set) only (a) in the event of a subsequent supply pressure failure and not (b) right away in the event of electrical failure.

(The two failures modes (loss of electricity, loss of supply pressure) can happen separately, or together.)

If the electricity is lost, the valve remains in the current state - whether null (parked) or delivering (rolling). The idea is that, even though the valve is electrically controlled, electrical power is not needed to hold the vehicle still, nor to hold the brakes off for rolling mode.

The application discusses the use of one such valve for a straight truck, and two for a tractor-trailer. Thus, the two species can easily be examined together. Therefore, applicant respectfully traverses the requirement for an election between Species A and Species B.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 20, 2007

Paul E. Szabo, Reg. No. 30,429

Telephone: 216/622-8578 Customer No.: 24024